THE ELECTIONS OFFENCES AND INQUIRIES BILL.

CLAUSE 2.

Mr. Nidiry moved that sub-section (1) of Section 164 C under sub-clause (2) of Clause 2 be deleted.

He said :—

"The specific interferences with the free exercise of electoral right are referred to in sub-section (2). Therefore the general statement in sub-section (1) in regard to such interference is not necessary. It is very vague and indefinite. The probable instances of interference are there. This indefinite Clause would be fraught with much danger".

Seconded by Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai.

Mr. Subba Aiyar:—

"With reference to this amendment, I may say that the retention of the Clause is very necessary. I do not think that it would be disputed for a moment that in the matter of elections there ought not to be any undue influence which will in any way interfere with the free exercise of electoral right. If this proposition is granted, the question is, what is undue influence? To make it simpler, certain specific instances explanatory of the general proposition are given in the sub-section. That does not mean that the sub-section exhausts the list. I do grant that it is put in a general way. But it is rather difficult to put it in any other way. Undue influence can only be general. Whether a particular action will come under undue influence or not may be safely left to the Court to decide. It must be a case arising out of the election enquiry and therefore a case before the Commissioners or a case before a Magistrate under Chapter IX A. In the former case, the persons constituting the Bench and in the latter case the High Court may be safely trusted to decide whether there has been undue influence or not. Therefore instead of trying to lay down a hard and fast rule as to what exactly is undue influence, a general statement saying that no body shall interfere by means of undue influence and two specific instances were put in. It is necessary to have both the general statement and the specific instances. If the specific instances alone be put in, there may be cases of undue influence which do not fall under that category. It is necessary to provide for them also. The sub-clauses may perhaps be put in as explanations rather than sub-clauses. The one does not restrict the other, but explains the other. For the above reasons, the Clause cannot be deleted."

Mr. Nidiry :—

"I am not at all satisfied with the arguments advanced by my friend Mr. Subba Aiyar for the retention of the Clause. As I said, the word "interfere" is indefinite and vague, and unless the Legislature makes it clear by defining it, it may lead to dangerous results. The people affected will have to carry the matter to the Magistrates and against their decision they will have to take the case to the High Court and obtain a decision. What I say is that the Legislature ought to define the word in the Bill itself and not leave it to the Magistrates to decide what is interference and what is not. To put it in such a vague and indefinite way and say that it is penal to interfere is very hard."

The amendment was put to the vote and lost.

Mr. Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai, in moving that the words "or has no reason to believe to be true" be inserted between the words "true" and "in" in line 3 of Section 164 G of sub-clause (2) of Clause 2, said:—

"The object of the Section apparently is that any person who makes a false statement either in favour of a person so that he may get the vote or against a person so that he may not get the vote should be punished. If he makes a false statement with regard to the personal character of another person, say a rival candidate at an election, he must do so at his own risk. He ought to take the trouble to see that his statement is correct. As it stands, probably a prosecution would be launched and the prosecution must prove that the person making the false statement knows it to be false. The burden of proof will be on the prosecution and it will be very difficult to prove that. What I suggest is that it will be enough if the prosecution proves that the person making the false statement has no reason to believe it to be true. A person who makes such a statement must make the necessary enquiry and satisfy himself that the fact about which he is going to speak is true. In other words, he must have some reason to believe that it is true. If he has not that reason, then he must be held guilty. This must be the object of the Section; otherwise, the rule would defeat itself, and any person can make a false statement and say that he does not believe it to be false. In the interests of purity of election, I think that the words 'or has no reason to believe to be true," should also be added in the Section.

Seconded by Mr. Kumaran Asan.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. Subba Aiyar :—

"I doubt whether the acceptance of the amendment will not seriously affect the public. The acceptance of the amendment would make the provision wider and more drastic. In other words, it will apply to a larger number of cases than the Section proposes to deal with. Seeing that it is a fight in an election, unless a person makes a false statement which he knows to be false or which he does not believe to be true, it is not desirable to convict him. I also rely upon the ordinary law with reference to perjury, *i. e.*, a false statement in a judicial proceeding, where we find the same definition (See Section 185 of the Penal Code). I do not think it necessary to make a false statement under this Bill wider than what it is according to the Penal Code. I do not think it desirable to make a distinction between a false statement in a judicial proceeding and a false statement made by a candidate in an election. If the amendment is put in, it is likely to affect the candidate prejudicially. As far as possible, it is desirable to restrict the scope of the section. Unless there is positive evidence to show that a person wilfully made a false statement, it is not desirable to have a conviction. Secondly, the definition has been taken from the Government of India Act, which contains word for word the definition given in the English Act. It has been the subject of judicial interpretation both in India and in England. As I have stated, it has also got the further advantage of having been already incorporated in the Penal Code. In these circumstances, I do not think it desirable to accept the amendment."

Mr. Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai :—

"My friend, Mr. Subba Aiyar, has no doubt correctly divined my object, which is to make the Section wider. I do not think he is right in drawing an analogy between a case of perjury under the Penal Code and a case of perjury here. In the case under the Penal Code, it is a very serious offence punishable even with seven years' imprisonment. Here the punishment is only a fine. I do not think there is much material for drawing a comparison between the two cases. Then again, whether it is a statement regarding the personal character of himself or a rival candidate, it should be viewed with stricter regard. Personal character should not be allowed to be attacked by any person who has no reason to believe his statement to be true. Because a man goes to an election, is he to be maligned? The statement may amount to a libel and, if so, it is not necessary that the person making the statement should himself know that it is false, if thereby he brings down the character of a person in the public estimation. Because he goes to an election contest, the man making the false statement may excuse himself by saying that he did not know it to be false. If he did not go to the election, the statement would have been a libel and punishable. The point for consideration for this Council is whether, because a man goes to an election, his personal character should be liable to be attacked without sufficient justification. No doubt, if the Council is of opinion that the personal character of a man who goes to an election is liable to unbridled aspersion, it is all right. The question is whether the personal character of a man who goes to an election should be subjected to this sort of aspersion by a person who has no reason to believe that aspersion to be true, and not whether there is an analogy between perjury under this Bill and perjury under the Penal Code."

After some further discussion, the amendment was put to the vote and lost.

CLAUSE 8.

Mr. Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai, in moving that the words "if such certificate has been granted" be inserted at the end of Proviso (ii) said :—

"The object of the provision apparently is to give a person who speaks the truth before the Commissioner some indemnity, so that he may not be pursued further by prosecution for perjury or a suit for damages. If the Commissioners are satisfied that he has been speaking truly, they give a certificate. If the Commissioners do not give a certificate, he is liable to be proceeded against for perjury for his making a false statement and he should be liable for damages to a person who is damnified by his statement. In such cases, the statement should be admissible in evidence in the prosecution or suit. The provision in the latter part of the Proviso is too general. The object of the Proviso is that if such certificate is not granted, the statement should be admissible in evidence, which it will not be as the Proviso stands. Hence my amendment."

Seconded by Mr. Raman Tampi.

Mr. Subba Aiyar: —

"The object of the Proviso seems to be that the witness who makes incriminating statements before the Commissioners must be in a much safer position than he would be under the ordinary law. Ordinarily, such statements should not be used in any Criminal Courts. Under the Evidence Act, Section 132, every witness is bound to answer a question even though by such an answer he may incriminate himself, but such answer shall

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

not be used as evidence against him later on in any criminal proceeding unless it be for perjury. That is the ordinary law of evidence. In this particular case, where the statements are generally supposed to be of an incriminating character, the object is that the witnesses should be given still further privilege, so that they may be at liberty to disclose the real truth, even though the statement may be incriminating. So long as we retain the former portion, they will escape prosecution under Chapter IX A. The latter portion is intended to give the witness complete immunity from any other proceeding. Of course, if there is independent evidence against the witness, he may be proceeded against. The statement by itself cannot be used against him. This object will be frustrated if the amendment be accepted. I therefore think that the Proviso may be left as it is."

Mr. Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai:—

"Suppose a particular witness appears at an election enquiry and says he saw a candidate giving a bribe to a voter. The candidate may not have bribed the voter What is the guarantee that the witness is speaking the truth? The statement will not amount to an admission that the witness is guilty of bribery which alone is an offence under Chapter IX A and will not disclose that he (the witness) has been guilty of any other offence because it is not he that gives the bribe. He only saw it. Such being the case, I ask what is the sanction for the witness to speak the truth. He could be guilty of only perjury, if he spoke falsehood, and for proving that, his statement before the Commissioners has to be admitted in evidence. This is not permitted under the Section as it stands. As it is, any witness can come and say anything. The first portion of the Proviso says that if he gets a certificate he is immune from prosecution. Suppose he is not able to get a certificate, it must naturally follow that he is guilty of some offence. How is that offence to be proved? If he gets a certificate, his statement is not admissible, and if he is not able to get a certificate, still that statement cannot be used as evidence."

After some further discussion, Mr. Subba Aiyar accepted the amendment and it was carried.

The consideration of the Bill over, Mr. Subba Aiyar moved that the Bill be finally read and passed, the operation of Rule 51 of the Rules being suspended.

Seconded by Mr. Raman Menon.

Carried.

Mr. Subrahmaniya Pillai:—

"Sir,

This is the last meeting of the Legislative Council under Regulation I of 1095, and we are therefore naturally tempted to look back upon the short period that has elapsed since its inception, take stock and review our past work. Such beneficial measures as the Municipal Regulation and Juvenile Smoking Regulation will ever occupy a prominent and honoured place in the Statute Book of the country; while the disciplinary Regulations, like the Police and the Public Canals and Public Ferries Regulations, must contribute not a little to public safety and convenience. The numerous interpellations on public questions ventilating public grievances and the general discussions during the Budget meetings have, we believe, been of some use to Government and the public at large.

At the time of the passing of Regulation I of 1095 public opinion was divided as to its adequacy to satisfy the legitimate political aspirations of the people. The signs of dissatisfaction have been unerringly diagnosed and a remedy has been found at present for insecure. I am at a disadvantage in speaking of you in your presence; but the occasion is exceptional, and I trust the council will forgive me for any breach of propriety. I must admit, Sir, that one of the noticeable features of your administration has been that the people are taken more and more into the confidence of the Government. This is evident from the very honorable and exemplary treatment we have been receiving at your hands in the Council, from the great attention you are used to pay to our remarks and opinions, from your tolerance of public criticism, and from your magnanimous attitude in being always open to conviction. We deeply appreciate the constitution of the Budget Committee with non-officials, the placing of all important Government proposals for public criticism, and your consultation with leading non-officials both formally and informally on important matters and weighing their considered opinion before final orders are passed.

Sir, you had not been many months in the land before you recognised frankly and publicly that new aspirations were stirring the hearts of the people and that it was necessary to satisfy them by giving them a larger share in the administration of public affairs. It was, I believe, in one of your earliest speeches that you were pleased to say thus: "It will thus be seen that it has ever been the earnest aim of H. H. the Maha Raja, whose accession to the *musnad* synchronised with the origin of popular government in this country, to train his subjects in the arts of civics and politics and to enable them to exert a continually growing influence over the administration of the state". You were pleased to vouchsafe the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

guarantee that it will be your endeavour to carry out the aforesaid earnest aim of His Highness the Maha Raja. We are grateful to His Highness for the gracious promulgation of Regulation II of 1097. The country owes a debt of gratitude to you also in that respect. The Regulation and the rules so far published, have been conceived in a spirit of broad and sound statesmanship and sagacity, so much so that they have been more or less well received by a very large section of the educated community and the press. Even the worst critics must ungrudgingly admit that some of the reforms, nay, most of the reforms that have been advocated by the public, have not been forgotten in the promulgation of the Regulation. The substantial non-official majority in the Council, the right to move resolutions on matters of public interest, the removal of limitation to the number of questions allowed to each member, the right of asking supplementary questions, the powers given for the discussion of the Budget of the State and for the voting of grants – these, I venture to think, are reforms calculated to benefit the people at large and to achieve the greatest happiness of the greatest number. There must be difference of opinion on details – A parlimentary government is always the aspiration of the people and a healthy and constitutional agitation towards the attainment of that ideal form of government, will, it is our sincere hope, never be misunderstood by His Highness' Government. On the other hand, we have received encouragement towards our aspirations by the reforms now granted by His Highness so soon after Regulation I of 1095. The reforms that will be inaugurated will open a new and important chapter in the political history of this country. I venture to predict, as one who has taken some part in the public life of this country, that the chief characteristics of the next few years will be a greater consideration for public opinion on the part of Government servants whether in the superior grades or in the subordinate grades, a larger realisation of the difficulties of the administration on the part of the people, and a closer co-operation between the two sides in promoting the moral and material interests of the people. I am confident—I believe my confidence is not misplaced—that in the rules to be finally passed, the electorates will be considerably wide so as to extend the franchise to the over-burdened and petty landowners and agriculturists, the average middle class men and the *'intelligentsia'* of the country. To adopt the words of Mr. Gokhale: "I want our men and women, without distinction of caste or creed, to have opportunities to grow to the full height of their stature unhampered by cramping and unnatural restrictions". I am also confident that all influential and intelligent minorities will secure representation in the Council and that Government will not be guided in the matter of nomination by a strict regard for numbers only. I am also confident that the most important part of the reforms, *viz.*, the power conferred on the members to raise discussion on administrative questions, will be amply availed of by the representatives and will lead to greater harmony and mutual understanding. The new arrangement, it is my sincere hope, will be inaugurated with the utmost good-will of all sections who must exercise mutual forbearance, and we owe it to ourselves and to the country's prosperous future. It is my firm belief that the working of the new Council will be so satisfactorily conducted that His Highness' Government may be emboldened to give additional concessions ere long and that you yourself may have the satisfaction of seeing the Council still further liberalised before handing over the reins of Government to your successor. Serene, clear-sighted, and supremely modest, you have been able to usher in this reform at an early date, and I am sure the same serenity, clear-sightedness and modesty will enable you to administer the State successfully so as to shower greater happiness and prosperity on this ancient Land of Charity.

I beg to thank you, Sir, on behalf of my constituency for the liberal reforms, and request that you may be kindly pleased to convey to His Highness the Maha Raja our feelings of heart-felt gratitude, loyalty and devotion to His Highness's throne and person."

Mr. Nidiry :—

"Sir,

I beg leave to take this opportunity to add a few words to what has been said by my friend Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai, as this meeting is the last one under Regulation I of 1095. Under its provision this Council was to continue for another year or so. But Regulation II of 1097 has cut short the life of this Council by one year. We are in no way sorry for it in our eagerness to welcome the reformed Council shaped by you. Among the Indian States, it was in Travancore that the Legislative Council was introduced for the first time. But it remained for a long time more or less an official entity like other Departments of the State with very little popular element in it. The people, or rather the educated section, began to look upon it as an out-of-date institution. Sir, it was at that juncture that your predecessor in office reformed the Council under Regulation I of 1095. The people of the State made loud complaints about the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

inadequacy of the reform both from the Council and outside. Soon after you became the Dewan of this State and the President of the Council, the matter was brought to your kind notice. Your first speech in the Council in kind appreciation of the work done by the Members of the Council and your long experience in the British Indian Administration emboldened me to interpellate on the reform of the Legislative Council and other representative institutions in the State. Though it was but one year since the Council was reformed, you bestowed your earnest and sympathetic attention on the matter and Regulation II of 1097 was the result of it. We, as the representatives of the people, shall be failing in our duty if we do not express our sincere gratitude and devotion to our beloved Sovereign, His most gracious Highness the Maha Raja, for granting large and ample concessions to his loyal subjects and to you for advising His Highness the Maha Raja and carrying out the reforms so soon. The reforms are in my opinion very substantial and quite adequate to meet the requirements of the people of the State at present. The people of Travancore will, I am sure, ever associate this reform with your name in gratitude and esteem. We request you to convey our respectful homage and sentiments of loyalty to His Highness the Maha Raja. May His Gracious Highness live long to see the beneficent fruits of the reforms which he so readily granted to us! May the reforms inaugurated by you contribute to the continued contentment and prosperity and advancement of the people whose welfare is so vey near to your heart!"

Mr. Trivikramar Vasudevar said that His Highness the Maha Raja had always regarded the welfare of his subjects as his welfare and that that could be seen in several of his acts. Regulation II of 1097 was only one of them. As soon as His Highness came to know that Regulation I of 1095 did not satisfy the people of the State, he was pleased to reconsider it and that even before the expiry of three years. The people of the State should ever feel grateful to His Highness for the new measure and to the Dewan for the great part he took in bringing about the measure and shaping it in its present form. On behalf of the Malayala Brahmin Jenmies, He thanked His Highness and the Dewan and wished them long life and health.

Mr. Kumaran Asan, while fully supporting the sentiments expressed by Mr. Trivikramar Vasudevar in regard to the new Regulation, II of 1097, hoped that the reforms contemplated by that Regulation would usher in a new era of happiness and prosperity to the country. Compared with the old Regulation I of 1095, the new Regulation conferred far greater powers and privileges on the people of the State. As a result of the general awakening in all countries, the people of the State became dissatisfied with the provisions of Regulation I of 1095, and His Highness the Maha Raja who had always the welfare of his subjects at heart granted the new Regulation in consonance with their desire to associate themselves with the administration of the country in a closer way. Hitherto their actions were influenced by communal considerations and the new Regulation cuts at the very root of it. He had no doubt that hereafter the people of all classes would work in harmony for the common good of the whole country so as to merit still greater privileges and powers at the hands of the Government. The people of the country should ever be grateful to His Highness the Maha Raja for the boons now granted and the Dewan for the liberal spirit in which he had conceived and shaped the new Regulation. He hoped that the Dewan might continue long to administer the country in the same liberal spirit.

Mr. Raman Tampi:—

"Sir,

In supporting the sentiments expressed by my learned colleagues, I would submit a few words. I fully endorse all that has been said by Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai with regard to your behaviour towards us the Members of the Council. With regard to the passing of Regulation II of 1097, personally I feel that the measure represents a substantial advance upon the law that has just now been superseded by this Regulation. At the first meeting of the Legislative Council under Regulation I of 1095, I said that while thanking His Gracious Highness the Maha Raja and the Government for passing that Regulation, the people felt that the powers granted to them under that Regulation did not go sufficiently far and that we entertained the hopes that, in the near future, that Regulation would be amended so as to give greater powers to the people. I am glad that the wish then expressed has now been fulfilled. Almost all the reforms that were demanded or rather claimed in public meetings after the passing of Regulation I of 1095 have now been conceded and in some respects the provisions of the new Regulation go even beyond what was claimed. I am aware that even now there is the criticism that the new Regulation is defective. But I have no doubt that in the working of the Regulation the greatest care will be taken by the people whose lot it will be to administer the law and that opportunities of coming into conflict with the representatives of the people will be

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

avoided. If the provisions of the new law are properly handled on the other side of the House, I have no doubt that the result will be great advancement in the country and large and substantial increase in the powers of the people. By saying that the present law goes far ahead of the law that has been superseded. I do not mean to say that the people will be absolutely satisfied even with the present law. We are growing. Our sentiments are growing also. Every institution including the Legislative Council ought to grow. I have no doubt that under the watchful guidance and solicitous care with which His Highness the Maha Raja rules this country, it will not be long before we shall have this Council invested with greater powers, powers which are associated with the Legislative Councils in other parts of India. I fervently hope that the members of the Council that is to come and the general public outside will harmoniously work together and that Government will work in such a way as not to come into conflict with the leaders of the people, so that all the parties may be mutually benefited. I shall certainly be failing in my duty if I do not on this occasion acknowledge the great part that you have yourself taken in shaping the present law relating to the Legislative Council. With these words, I once more wish to express my appreciation of the way in which you have treated the Members of the Council."

Mr. Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai:—

"Sir,

Permit me to give expression to my humble appreciation of the measure which has brought forth the new Council. I have not come prepared to speak on the merits of the Regulation. This is not the occasion either for it. The measure has no doubt come in for some criticism. Every public measure is capable of criticism. The fact that a measure is criticized adds to the importance—the predominant importance—of the measure. This measure has also received criticism like any other prominent measure. It cannot however be denied by any right-thinking man that it is a distinct advance over the old measure. For that, the humble thanks of the people are due first to His Highness the Maha Raja and next to you. If you permit me to sound a personal note, I may add a few words. I was one of those who were in the forefront of the agitation against Regulation I of 1095. It is therefore a source of personal gratification to me that, even before the lapse of one normal life of three years of the Council under Regulation I of 1095, that Council has ceased to exist and that the new measure has been promulgated. It is also specially noteworthy that, even within one year of your administration, you held out definite hopes that the measure would be reconsidered and that you advised His Highness the Maha Raja for passing a measure in consonance with the desire expressed by us. To that extent it is a source of personal gratification to me and I am specially grateful to His Highness for granting the new measure and also to you who have been instrumental in advising His Highness to grant this measure which is much in consonance with the demands of the people hitherto made".

Mr. Adam Sait:—

"Sir,

Since my brother non-official Members have set forth in detail the various reforms effected during your short *regime* for the well-being of the people, I have only to support the sentiments expressed therein, reiterating the same. But at the same time it would be unfair on my part if I were to close my speech without taking this opportunity to express the heart-felt thanks of the Muslims of the State, whom I represent, for the benefits conferred upon them by His Most Gracious Highness the Maha Raja. I assure you, Sir, that the Muslims will be ever grateful and firmly hope that their long-standing representations for an increased share in the State service will be most sympathetically considered by the benign Government and that more seats in the reformed council will be given to them in consideration of their population, service and the material contribution they have made for the advancement of the State. May Allah bless His Gracious Highness the Maha Raja with long life and bless, abundantly bless, His Highness to confer many more boons on his loving subjects. We likewise pray Allah to make your *regime* an unprecedented success so as to enable you to render many a beneficial service to the people of the State. I assure you, Sir, once again, that they will be ever indebted for the benefits they derive during your career as the Dewan of the State. I request you to convey to His Most Gracious Highness the humble message of the unstinted loyalty of the Muslim."

President:—

'Gentlemen,

I was not aware until I came here this noon that the closing of this session was going to be marked by speeches from the non-official side of the House I can therefore only make a haphazard reply.

Your remarks, however, have made my task easy. I find that it is practically the unanimous opinon of the non-official members of the House that Regulation II of 1097 is

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

a distinct advance on the old Regulation, I of 1095, and I am glad that that is the opinion of the constituted representatives of the people. Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai, the first speaker, and the other gentlemen that followed him, have mentioned some of the salient features of Regulation II of 1097, the larger powers it confers on the Members of the Council and the larger representation of the people on it, and we all look forward to much from the enlarged Council. But, Gentlemen, it is only excusable if we give expression to a natural feeling of regret at the dissolution of this Council on which we have been jointly working so far. This is the first Council in which there has been a direct representation of the people, and limited as the non-official element in this Council has been, I think that the Council can claim to its credit a very substantial amount of good work well done I have before me a list which shows that as many as fifteen Legislative enactments have been passed by this Council, not to speak of the enactments which have been passed to-day. And, as you know, the Council discussed the Budget on two occasions and on one occasion some of the non-official Members of the Council examined the Budget informally, and on all occasions on which the Council met, the Government have invariably received the willing co-operation of its non-official Members and many useful suggestions from them. It is therefore to me a most pleasing duty to acknowledge on this occasion the indebtedness of the Government to the helpful way in which the non-official side of this House has done its work and the great measure of help which the Government have received from the non-official Members. We will now turn our attention to Regulation II of 1097. As some of the speakers have already said, there is no human measure which can escape criticism and a healthy feeling of discontent is necessary for all progress in this world. I do not think that Regulation II of 1097 is the last word on the subject of the Legislative Council in this State. I am glad to see that there is a wide appreciation of the fact that this Regulation is a substantial advance on its predecessor and marks a big step in the share given to the people in the Government of the State.

It was very kind of you to refer in such flattering terms to me personally. I am afraid that the terms in which you have referred to me are far too flattering. I have always been glad and willing to do what little I can for those among whom my lot is cast. But, let me assure you, Gentlemen, that this new legislative enactment and the enlarged Council to be brought into existence thereby would not have been possible but for the great sagacity and wisdom and the whole-hearted devotion of His Highness the Maha Raja to the welfare of his subjects. It is known even to a child in this country that, day in and day out, His Highness' constant thought is the real welfare of his subjects and that he spares no pains whatever to work for that end. Unaffected by praise or blame alike, His Highness goes on from day to day labouring for the good of the country and for the welfare of the people committed to his care. But for that fact, let me tell you —and that plainly— that this legislation would not have been possible so soon after the passing of Regulation I of 1095. His Highness knows far better than any other the proper time and measure of each advance. It will be a very great pleasure to me to convey to His Highness the sentiments of thankfulness, gratitude and devotion to which you have given such feeling expression in this hall to-day.

Now, gentlemen, you have said that the new Council is a real advance over the present one. But let me tell you that the good results of this reform will depend not so much on the enhanced powers that are given to the Members of the Council as on their recognition of the heavier responsibility attaching to them consequent on the grant of those powers. I am not oblivious of the fact that Government and Governmental officers should similarly realise their responsibility and consider that it is part of their duty to understand and appreciate the non-official view point. But you will see that the official element in the future Council is dinstinctly smaller than the non-official and no real good can be expected unless and until the latter element realises to the full its responsibilities and also realises the important fact that the art of Government is by no means easy. The Members of the present Council have given ample evidence of their realisation of this truth, and acknowledge with gratitude their earnest desire to co-operate with Government. My sincere hope is that the Members who will be returned to the enlarged Council would be equally alive to a sense of responsibility and would pursue a course of constructive helpfulness. Let me finally express the hope that all of you that sit on the present Council may be returned to the new Council.

The suggestions made by Mr. Subrahmanya Pillai in regard to the Rules relating to franchise etc., are receiving the careful consideration of Government. The public will very soon see the draft rules published in the Gazette, and they will be given time to make their suggestions. With these words, Gentlemen, I dissolve this meeting."

The Council adjourned at 4-30 P. M.

S.PARAMESWARA AIYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly